Was Ibn Taymiah from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jama'ah?

By:

Moulana Muhammad Abū Bakr Ghāzīpūrī al-Anṣārī

Translation edited by: Mufti A H Elias (May Allaah protect him)

Contents

Forward:

All praise is due only to Allaah. We laud Him and beseech His aid and beg forgiveness only from Him and believe in Him and rely solely on Him. We seek salvation in Him from the evils of our inner selves and the vices of our actions. There is none to misguide one whom Allaah intends to guide. I bear witness that there is no one worthy of worship but Allaah, the One who has no partner. I also testify that Hadhrat Muhammad ρ is the faithful servant and the Last Rasul of Allaah. May Allaah Ta'ala's mercy be on him, his family and his Sahabaah τ and may He bless them and raise their status.

This work can be divided into three parts – the first linking the statements of Ibn Taymiyah to the authentic Sufis, the second quoting some of the ludicrous beliefs of the great icon of the Salafis and the third, as the appendix explains, that Ibn Taymiyah was not a true Alim by academic standards.

The current day Salafis, who at times label themselves as 'Ahle Hadith'/ 'Ghair Muqalids' go to the extreme due to the lack of knowledge and deficiency in Ilm. Due to their stubbornness they strongly criticize in vile languages the statements of reliable, pious Sufis and Ulema of Deoband. The able author Moulana Muhammad Abu Bkar Ghazipuri highlights those very statements which they are against as being totally similar to what their guide, their leader, their Imaam of Deen, the one whom they quote day and night, whom they call Shaykhul Islaam none other than Ibn Taymiyah holds. The author correctly asks them to rule on their Shaykhul Islaam.

Many a historical icon once probed and investigated proved to be a disaster.

The weird, strange, fallacious beliefs of Ibn Taymiyah are simplified yet again for answering by the current Salafis.

Lastly, from an academic view the status of Ibn Taymiyah is assessed. The reader is all along encouraged to be the judge and formulate an informed opinion of their own – not one propelled by propaganda and lop-sided information.

Few years ago even reliable scholars thought that no-one was better than Al-Bani but when his knowledge was un-velied he became history. Ibn Tayimah's path to oblivion is following close by.

We make Duaa that Allaah Jalla Majdahu grants all of us the ability to follow and adhere to the way and pattern of the Ahlus Sunnat wal Jamaat. A simple fomula is to be adherent to one of the Mazhabs of Fiqh.

A H Elias (Mufti)
May Allaah be with him.
1430/2009

Preface

Alḥamdu lillāhi Rabbil 'ālamīn waṣ ṣalātu was salāmu 'alā sayyidil mursalīn wa ālihi wa ṣaḥbihi ajma'īn.

These days many tribulations, various calamities and pains which Allaah alone knows afflict the Islaamic Ummah. Yet Allaah *'azza wa jalla* does not oppress His slaves. These tribulations and calamities are due to what we have earned by way of our disobedience and sins. The only escape is to turn to Allaah and repent and strive against the

ego and passions. We should have correct belief, perform pious deeds, abstain from disobedience, and be zealous in remembering Him, establishing the symbols and pillars of the Dīn, calling to the Quraan and Sunnah and entrenching divine law in our lives.

In the same way we are bound at the present moment to avoid everything which causes division and separation amongst the Islaamic body and hatred and jealousy in human society. The weakness, disgrace and humiliation we are suffering is due to nothing besides this disunity amongst Muslims and Islaamic groups and contempt for one another.

Our struggle in these evil conditions which the Muslims witness throughout the Islaamic world, is to hold on to Allaah's rope, arrange our ranks and avoid all that causes disunity and dispute amongst Muslims. We should be a single hand, a single power and a single army against the enemies – the enemies of Islaam and the Muslims, the enemies of Allaah and His Rasūl ρ.

If we uphold this struggle which is compulsory upon us in these times, our condition will be other than what we find ourselves in right now. With the permission and will of Allaah our lost honour, awe and power will be restored.

It is extremely regrettable that not only do the Muslims not understand this reality, they do not even attempt to understand it. They are involved in that which does not benefit them. They walk the contrary path and think that that is the compulsory struggle and a duty from Allaah and His Rasūl ρ. *Innā lillāhi wa innā ilayhi rāji'ūn.*

A sample of this diversion from the Islaamic path is in the form of the westernisation of the sect which claims association with the Predecessors and thus calls itself Salafīyah. Sometimes they associate themselves with Ḥadīth and call themselves Ahlul Ḥadīth. Sometimes they pride themselves on not following the Four Imāms whose Fiqh

the Ummah follows. They are then “Ghayr Muqallid.” The names are many but the meaning is the same.

This sect is today a major calamity upon the entire Ummah, from east to west, from north to south. Their efforts today are directed at proclaiming the majority of Muslims to be Kāfir, Innovators and outside the pale of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah. It regards itself to be the sole group with correct belief, Imān, Islaam, Quraan and Ḥadīth. Those who enter the sect are the only true Muslims. Besides them all are Kuffār and apostates. Their attitude is the same as the Khawārij in Islaamic history. We seek Allaah’s protection against their evil and place Him upon their necks. How many calamities, disasters, trials and tribulations is the Islaamic Ummah not suffering, yet how many of the Ummah do they not expel from Islaam and issue Fatāwā that they are astray and Mushrikūn? Every day there is a new book, every day there is a new publication, evry day there is a new statement in this regard. *This* is their Jihād. *Wa lā ḥawla wa lā quwwata illā billāhil ‘Azhīm.*

These “Mujāhids” – and I have no doubt that they are agents of the satanic powers of the Jews and Christians who work for them and fulfil their satanic desires of weakening Islaam’s strength, spreading confusion in Islaamic society, and causing weakness and mutual confrontation amongst Muslims – have their sights specially on the those of Deobandī thought and their ‘Ulamā’ and spiritual leaders. They continuously lay in ambush for them and seek to drive the Muslims away from them. They hatch such plots against them that none can be pleased with except Satan. They come up with such lies and concoctions against the leaders and elders of Deoband, that the ‘Arsh of ar-Raḥmān could shake with these. Whoever wishes to study their filth should peruse their book, “*Ad-Diyūbnadīyah*.” By means of books and publications they strive to make the Muslims averse to the ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband despite the efforts to combat idolatrous beliefs.

When I travelled this during Ramaḍān for the purpose of ‘Umrah, I was fortunate enough to visit the Two Noble Ḥarams. At that time

some brothers were given two writings of this type. The first was an Arabic text of eight pages, named, “*Ash-Shajarah al-Khabīthah*.” It included the picture of a tree, with branches, twigs and leaves. Each leaf had the name of an Islaamic sect present in the world. All these sects were thus growing from the *shajarah khabīthah* (filthy tree) with weak roots, while Salafīs and Ghayr Muqallids were shown growing from *shajarah ṭayyibah* whose roots are firm and branches extend to the sky.

The second writing was a text of 66 pages called, “*Are the ‘Ulamā’ of the Deobandī sect from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah*?” This booklet was first published in Arabic, and then translated into Urdu. I have a copy of the translation, not the original. Al-Maktab at-Ta‘āwunī lid Da‘wah wal Irshād wa Taw‘ītil Jāliyah at as-Sunnī, ar-Riyāḍ had published both booklets. As for *who* had composed them, this was not mentioned on the front cover, inside or on the back cover.

The contents of the booklet was entirely extracted from the book of an innovator, drowned in innovation and fantasies. He is an implacable enemy of the ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband. This man, Arshad al-Qādirī, is known in India for blatant lies in his writings against the Deobandis.

The “great Islaamic hero” who compiled this booklet who exhibits his Imānī bravery by hiding his name, has done no favour to himself or his group to which he claims affiliation. The basis upon which he proclaims Deoband to be astray and outside the pale of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah is the same as the basis clealy found with that sect.

Would he be pleased if someone should write a book called, “*Is the Salafī sect and those without Maẓhab part of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah*”?

The composer lists in the booklet some incidents of the *kashf* and miracles of the elders of Deoband and presents these as the basis of Deobandī belief. He holds these *Kashf* and miracles to be misguidance, *Shirk* and contrary to the beliefs of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah. He thus asks after mentioning the *Kashf* and miracles, "Is the Deobandī sect part of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah?"

The uninformed deceived one has no concept that *Kashf* and miracles do not form the basis of belief, whether of Deobandīs or others, since it does not give the benefit of absolute certainty. Something which does not fulfil this criterion can never be a basis of belief. There are no two who will disagree on this matter. Thus his question, ""*Are the 'Ulamā' of the Deobandī sect from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah*?" is absolutely futile. It is based on stories of miracles, *Kashf* and other facts which are essentially true according to the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah such as the Life of the Ambiyaa, the need for *Taqlīd* of the *Aimmah* or the status of *Taṣṣawwuf*.

Despite the excesses of this sect which makes Muslims into disbelievers which is spreading day-by-day and expanding from place to place, we turn our gaze away from them. Some people are unaware of their state and fall into their snares, and then hold a bad opinion on the elders and 'Ulamā' of Deoband. We are thus forced to examine their beliefs and see how much of a difference there is between them and Deoband. Since the basic doctrines and beliefs concerning *Shirk* and *Bid'ah* are the same, why then is Deoband singled out for expulsion from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah? Why are the Salafī. Ghayr Muqallid and "Saved" sects not expelled despite common beliefs and deeds?

It is known amongst all the people of knowledge that the Salafī sect never diverts in minor or major matters from the beliefs of al-Ḥāfizh Ibn Taymiyah and his student, Ibn Qayyim. According to this sect, Dīn is whatever Ibn Taymiyah and Ibn Qayyim held Dīn to be. True doctrine according to them is what Ibn Taymiyah and Ibn Qayyim believed. Thus these two are the scales and measures of truth and

falsehood, of belief and disbelief, of correct belief and incorrect. According to the Salafīs, whoever contradicts the two of them is outside the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah.

We would therefore like to take this opportunity to examine some of the beliefs of Ibn Taymiyah so that truth and falsehood can be clarified, and we can know who is really upon guidance and the Straight Path. Is it not possible that it is Ibn Taymiyah and his followers who have abandoned the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah due to these beliefs?

The reader should know that we have nothing but honour and respect in our hearts for Ibn Taymiyah, may Allaah's mercy be upon him. We consider him to be from amongst those 'Ulamā' upon whose hands Allaah brought about much goodness. Through him He removed many innovations, nonsense, *shirk* acts and grave-worship. He memorised the Quraan and Ḥadīth. He was a veritable ocean of Dīnī knowledge. Despite that, he was not innocent of mistakes in regards knowledge and belief. May Allaah pardon us and him. He was not of the status of an Imām whose *Taqlīd* can be made on everything, just as there is no Imām or 'Ālim in the Ummah upon whom *Taqlīd* can be made in all matters.

In the following pages there will be presented selected beliefs of Ibn Taymiyah, taken from his famous writings which circulate amongst people. We seek Allaah's help and rely upon Him. Allaah's salutations and peace be upon Muḥammad, his family and all his companions.

I am the one in need of Allaah's mercy, Muḥammad Abū Bakr Ghāzīpūrī, son of Mawlānā Bakhsh al-Anṣārī.
Book completed on the night of Thursday after 'Ishā, 8th Shawwāl al-Mukarram 1427 Hijrī.

All praise belongs to Allaah, Creator of the heavens and earth. Salutations and peace be upon Muḥammad, Chief of the Messengers, Seal of the Ambiyaa, and upon all his companions and family, the righteous, guides and guided, and upon the pious and truthful friends of Allaah.

This is an explanation of some of the beliefs of ash-Shaykh al-Ḥāfizh Ḥujjatul Islaam wa Qudratul Anām, al-'Ārif ar-Rabbānī, Ibn Taymiyah al-Ḥarrāni, Allaah's mercy be upon him, whose heart was filled with Quraanic light. These beliefs are taken from valuable writings which are circulated amongst people. I present these beliefs of Ibn Taymiyah to the readers so that it may be clarified to them if he was of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah or not[1]. Allaah guides to the Straight Path. He is sufficient for me and the best disposer of affairs. Here now lies before you the beliefs of Shaykhul Islaam, Allaah's mercy be upon him.

---

[1] The Salāfīs expel Allaah's friend's and the noble, pious Ṣūfīs from the Ahlus Sunnah, and deny *Kashf* and the appearance of extra-natural acts at the hands of the pious amongst Allaah's slaves, and declare the acts of the Ṣūfīs to be misguidance. They regard Ibn Taymiyah as their leader and establish their belief system upon the beliefs of that Ḥārrānī Shaykh. When he is their pivot in Dīn, belief and maẓhab, the question arises – are the Salāfīs part of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah? If they dissociate themselves from Ibn Taymiyah;s beliefs which we shall mention, then we ask if they will declare their denial of these in the interests of declaring the truth and presenting and reply?

Ibn Taymiyah’s belief on extra-natural events

[*Khawāriq* – events which are outside “normal natural” events. I have chosen to translate this as “extra-natural” to avoid the modern connotations of “supernatural” - translator]

He said, “There are certain extra-natural events which are related to knowledge, such as *Kashf*. Others are related to power and kingdom such as enacting acts which are extra-natural. Others are related to self-sufficiency in apparent gifts people are given, such as knowledge, authority, wealth and independence. All these what Allaah grants His slave is in order for him to use it as an aid upon what Allaah loves and is pleased with, and to draw closer to Him. Through it He raises his status through the commands of Allaah and His Rasūl. In that way his rank and closeness to Allaah and His Rasūl increase.”
[al-Fatāwā, V11, p299]

O noble brothers, ponder over this belief of Ibn Taymiyah. Then ask, “By Allaah, is this not the exact same belief as that of the Ṣūfīs?” In that case, Ḥujjatul Islaam Ibn Taymiyah is with the people of *Taṣṣawuf*, the people of “misguidance and nonsense.” He is not with the present Salafīs, the people of “the Quraan and Imaan.”

Tell us, O Salafī brothers, O Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah, what is then your Fatwā about your Shaykh? Was he of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah or was he astray and misguided others?

Come, O truthful believing brothers, let us see what these words establish about you concerning strange occurrences:

1. Extra-natural events are proven for the saints.
2. There are various forms of extra-natural events. Some are related to power, such as the effects of a saint on the world.
3. Some are related to knowledge such as the knowledge of a slave which none besides him knows.

4. Unseen matters shown to him by means of *Kashf*.
5. Self-sufficiency from that which the general masses on dependants upon.
6. Independence from eating, drinking, learning, reading and writing.
7. These extra-natural events bring the slave closer to Allaah in station and are aids in attaining the pleasure of Allaah and His Rasūl ρ.

These are encompassed in the words of al-Ḥāfizh Ibn Taymiyah, which we just quoted. Thus if someone believes that a saint could assist someone in distress, in his absence, or learns of a man's condition whilst being far from him, or walks on water; or flies in the air; or he attained some knowledge without direct learning; or that the conditions of the inmates of graves are shown to him; these beliefs and the many similar ones are nothing by which someone can be faulted for. He is not a man who contradicts the Quraan and Sunnah. If it were, then it would not have been part of the beliefs of Shaykhul Islaam.

What is the stance of the Salafis is in regards this belief? What is their opinion on Shaykhul Islaam Ibn Taymiyah? Is he of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah or not? O brothers, refrain from flinging accusations of evil against the elders and not attempt to cause grief to Allaah and His Rasūl ρ with regard to their friends. The punishment for that is all-encompassing. Allaah guides whom He will to the Straight Path.

There are various forms of Kashf

Ibn Tayamiyah said, "Sometimes he is shown the exact object when *Kashf* of it is made. Sometimes he sees an image of it in his heart which acts as a mirror for him. The heart sees as well. This can occur while awake or asleep, such as when a man sees something in his

dream and then sees the exact thing when he awakens without any change to it.” [V 11; p 638]

Here the Shaykh speaks in the language of the Ṣūfīs. The Ṣūfīs do not say anything different from Shaykhul Islaam in regards *kashf* and *Murāqabah*.

My Salafī brothers turn to Ibn Taymiyah and regard him as a proof in Dīn and the Imām of the Ahlus Sunnah. I now ask them with all due respect and honour, what is your opinion with regard to these words of the Shaykh? Are these the words of a man who has diverted from the correct belief? Are these words of an Imām of the Ahlus Sunnah, or misguided ones who have strayed from the Straight Path?

If these words are incorrect according to you and if such belief is contrary to the Quraan and Sunnah, then do not hide the truth. “Do not cover it with falsehood and you know it.”

Dear brothers! I invite you to ponder over the words of the Shaykh of Islaam and the Muslims. If you have given it thought, the following would have become apparent to you:

1. Sometimes the one experiencing *Kashf* sees the revealed object as itself without any change.
2. Sometimes he sees an image in his heart, while he is awake, but it is like a dream.
3. That which he dreams of he can later see in its original form when awake.

So believe in this, O Salafī brethren! This is the belief of the great scholar in whose heart Quraanic light was placed. May Allaah have mercy on him and us all. He always spoke the truth and was honest in his speech. He would never make that which contradicts the Quraan and Sunnah his belief and Dīn. That is what we think of him. Tell us what you think of him O brothers of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah, O people of the Quraan and Ḥadīth.

He who unconditionally attacks the Ṣūfīs is immoderate

He said the following concerning Taṣawwuf and its people, "There is a group which reviles Taṣawwuf and the Ṣūfīs as innovators and outside the Ahlus Sunnah. Another group goes to extremes in their regards and claims that they are the best and most perfect of creation. Both of these are reprehensible extremes. The correct view is that they strive in Allaah's obedience, just as others strive in Allaah's obedience. Amongst them are those well ahead in closeness according to their efforts. Others are more moderate and they are the *People of the Right Hand*…Yet there is also attributed to them those who have wronged themselves and disobeyed their Rabb." [v11; p18]

He then mentioned in regards those well ahead and the moderate ones amongst the Ṣūfīs, that they are the true Ṣūfīs and described their qualities. [p19]

Thus al-Ḥāfizh Ibn Taymiyah does not unconditionally attack Taṣawwuf and Ṣūfīs. He speaks like a person of knowledge about them, not like those ignorant of reality. He relates what is true about Taṣawwuf and Ṣūfīs.

O Salafī brothers, turn to guidance and fix your gaze at the words of Ḥujjatul Islaam. Do not be amongst those whom the tongue of Imām Ahlus Sunnah labelled as, "reprehensible." Do not revile ar-Raḥmān's friends, for indeed His Throne shakes at that. Allaah's anger ignites at that.

Who can be more wrong and ignorant then he who describes Taṣawwuf in a nonsense manner and attacks its people without any restriction; whose tongue moves against Allaah's people and views that condoned in Sharī'ah as innovation; and expels the Ṣūfīs from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah?

Special people know nations' punishments through Kashf

Ibn Taymiyah said, "As for the special ones amongst people, they know the punishments of nations through the *Kashf* Allaah gives them." [v11; p69]

Meaning that they are informed of something which belongs to the knowledge unseen to others – will this one die as a believer or not? Will he die poor or rich? Will he die in his land or not?

I ask the Salafī sect, who are the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah? Is this a belief of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah according to you? Does one who declares such a belief remain a Muslim? If not, then proclaim the truth, O People of the truth. Do not hide the truth about Ḥujjatul Islaam.

I have read much about what you say in regards our Mashāikh of Deoband. I know your style, but have chosen to be patient and not attack you in the style of your harsh words against our elders. Natural vulgarity and deliberate vulgarity degrades knowledge and the 'Ulamā'. Obsenity is not a quality of a believer.

O brothers! When you know the belief of your leader, then either repent from your audacious statements against the 'Ulamā' and Mashāikh of Deoband, or expel Shaykhul Islaam from the Ahlus Sunnah and declare him to be a frivolous innovator. Weigh the matters with a balanced scale.

O Salafī brothers! Do not be like those who give short measure. "Those who when they receive measure demand their full right, but when they have to measure or weigh for others they give short." Surely guidance is in Allaah's Hands.

Allaah's addresses His friends and shows them Kashf

Shyakhul Islaam said, "These are true matters which 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb τ told us about which occur to obedient ones. These are matters which the Most Honourable and Majestic makes *kashf* of. Allaah's friends have *Mukhāṭabāt* and *Kashf*. [v11; p205]

You know the meaning of *Kashf* from the previous discussion. Allaah shows the obedient ones matters which are hidden from the eyes of the general people. They witness it and others do not. They are informed of what others are not.

Mukhāṭabāt means that Allaah sometimes addresses His friend, and sometimes the saint addresses Allaah. Sometimes the saint addresses unseen beings like Jinn, angels and souls and sometimes they converse with him.

These *Mukhāṭabāt* and *Kashf* occur to the saint during both sleep and wakefulness.

Yes, this is the belief of virtuous Imām which he registered in his Fatāwā. So what do you, O Salafīs, think about this august Imām? Was he of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah or not? How can he possibly be part of the Ahlus Sunnah according to contemporary Salafīs, since they regard such beliefs as negation of Imān and Islaam? They say that someone who believes that is outside the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah and part of the sect with ridiculous beliefs, the Ṣūfīs. In fact, such a person does not belong to the community of our Nabī, Muḥammad ρ. Perhaps there is a different scale for Shakhul Islaam according to you, O brothers, and misguidance is only for the Deobandīs?

O brothers, what proof do you have to negate the belief of Shaykhul Islaam? We all know that it does not originate except from the Quraan, Sunnah and what the majority of Imāms believed.

Anyone can perform extra-natural acts, but a saint is one who follows the Quraan and Sunnah

He said in his Fatāwā, "You will find many like these and will believe that he has to be Allaah's friend because of the *Kashf* he displayed in certain matters, or extra-natural acts such as he indicates to someone and that person dies, or he flies in the sky to Makkah or elsewhere, or sometimes walks on water, or he fills up an empty container, or he at times spends from unseen sources, or he may become invisible to people's eyes, or someone is in need and he is not there but he suddenly appears and fulfils his need, or he informs the people about their stolen goods or other unseen matters, etc…. These matters are extra-natural and the performer may be Allaah's friend or His enemy. Do not think that whoever performs these acts is necessarily Allaah's friend. Friends of Allaah are assessed according to their qualities, deeds and conditions as outlined in the Quraan and Sunnah. [v11; p214]

Allaah be praised for the Shaykh who uttered the truth and spoke in the language of Deoband. This is indeed the exact belief of the elders and 'Ulamā' of Deoband. Who say nothing different to Ibn Taymiyah in regards sainthood and extra-natural acts. It is as if he has explained what is *their* belief concerning Allaah's friends. If there is any doubt in what I have said, then *Alhamdulillaah*, the 'Ulamā' of Deoband are to be found in every place on earth, go enquire from them or refer to their publications on *Taṣṣawuf* and character. You will discover exactly what I had said.

Ibn Taymiyah's words prove that these extra-natural acts are not farfetched for Allaah's friends. It is an honour which Allaah confers on them due to their obedience and Him being pleased with them. They worship Him and sacrifice their desires for His sake.

Shaykhul Islaam repeats this in another place in the same volume of his Fatāwā, "The pious friends of Allaah are the followers of Muḥammad ρ. They do as He commanded and abstain from what He

criticised. They follow Him in all that is clear to them that they should follow Him… Allaah helps them with His angels and a spirit from Him and sends from His light into their hearts. Allaah honours then by way of miracles which are also proofs for the Dīn and help for the Muslims. [v11; p 17]

I am utterly amazed at the Salafī brothers for their attacks against the friends of Allaah from the people of *Taṣawwuf* whom Allaah had honoured with miracles. How can they regard attacks against the Ṣūfīs to be permitted and how can they deny miracles from the slaves of ar-Raḥmān, when Ibn Taymiyah, their leader in belief and Maẓhab, categorically establishes the reality of extra-natural acts and miracles at the hands of Allaah's friends and declares them to be amongst Allaah's great bounties to them?

If by virtue of their belief in these acts and miracles, the Mashāikh and 'Ulāmā' of Deoband are expelled from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah and are to be considered innovators with doubtful faith, then what is the status of Shaykhul Islaam for believing the same as the Deobandīs? O noble ones, how can his faith be intact? How can he remain within the congregation of the Muslims? Why is he not attacked in regards his Dīn and belief? Had you thought about him before making your statements in regards Deoband, it would have better for you, O denying brothers.

Once you have pondered the just quoted words of the Shaykh, the following should become apparent to you:

1. Extra-natural acts are established from Allaah's friends and cannot be denied.
2. Miracles are bounties from Allaah to His pious slaves. Allaah honours them thus to illustrate their status with Him.
3. It is not impossible that a person can die with the mere indication of the saint.
4. It is not impossible that a saint can walk on water.

5. It is not impossible that a saint can fly in the air to Makkah or elsewhere.
6. It is not impossible that he can spend from unseen sources.
7. It is not impossible that he can be invisible to people's sight.
8. That someone seeks his help and the saint appears to help him and the one in distress sees him, whereas the saint was absent or dead.
9. That a saint informs people about their stolen wealth.
10. The saint informs people about someone missing or sick.

Al-Imām Ibn Taymiyah declares all of this possible for a saint and he is an Imām in Quraan and Ḥadīth and a proof in matters of Dīn. What is then wrong with the Salafīs that they deny this for the saints? Who is more knowledgeable of Sharī'ah, Dīn, Quraan and Sunnah – you or the Imām?

When these acts and miracles are possible for saints, then why do raise a hue and cry on the possibility of them occurring at the hands of the Mashāikh of Deoband and describe them in an ugly manner? If you do not regard these Mashāikha and 'Ulāma to be pious friends of Allaah and perfect believers who follow the Quraan and Sunnah, then O slaves of Allaah, fear Him! They were certainly pious friends of Allaah. The like of them is rarely to be found on the face of the earth. They were like angels in human form; averse to the world and desirous of the Ākhirah; worshippers at night, warriors in the day. Their faces shone with the light of taqwā and Imaan. Their hearts were attached to Allaah wherever they went and whatever they were paying attention to. They were humble to the believers and firm against the Kuffār. They placed the edifice of Dīn and belief upon a firm foundation of Quraan and Sunnah and spread the Word of Truth in the world, as the poet said, "Those are my forebears, bring the like of them if you can, O Jarīr."

Whoever doubts our description of them should read their biographies and research their condition. If they are to be found to be really as described and the condition of their Dīn is that of Taqwā,

then why is it far-fetched that they should have performed miracles? Miracles at the hands of Allaah's friends are true according to the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah.

Additional explanation of Kashf from Ibn Taymiyah

The pious Imām said, "Amongst those extra-natural acts in regards knowledge are those where the slave sometimes hears that which others cannot hear. Sometimes he can see that which others cannot see, whether awake or asleep. Sometimes he learns that which others do not such as through *Waḥy* or *Ilhām* or revealing of necessary knowledge; or true insight. These are called *Kashf, Mushāhadāt* and *Mukāshafāt*. Hearing is called *Mukhāṭabāt*, seeing is called *Mushāhadāt* and knowledge is called *Mukāshafah*. They are also collectively called *Kashf/Mukashafah* i.e. *Kashf* was made to him. [v11; p313]

These are the words of the pious Imām in regards the reality of *Kashf* and an exposition of the different kinds. It is variously in the either the form of hearing, vision or knowledge. According to contemporary Salafīs, words like these are misguidance, false belief and words of the people of *Shirk*. O slaves of Allaah, was Ibn Tyamiyah a *Mushrik* or a misguided man according to you?

The reality which cannot be hidden is that the Salafī sect is amongst the most ignorant people in regards the realities of Dīn and most far from the path of guidance. If it were not so, they would not have been enemies of ar-Raḥmān's friends and they would not have walked the path transgression and excess. "He who Allaah lets go astray has no guide." "He for whom Allaah had not created a light, will have no light."

It is necessary for the slave to set some time for solitude

Shaykhul Islaam said, "It is necessary that the slave set aside some time alone for Ẓikr, Ṣalāh, meditation, self-reckoning and rectifying his heart. This can either be inside his house or elsewhere." [v 10; p 429]

This is what the Ṣūfīs term as, "*Khalwah*." If you regard that as monasticism then I would like to ask you, "If this is a rejected act which has no basis in Sharī'ah and is an innovation in Dīn, then what is your Fatwā on the pious Imām whose heart was filled with Quraanic light? Was he ignorant on what is established and what is not established in Sharī'ah – and we seek Allaah's protection against such an accusation – or was he an inviter to innovations and concoctions? Was he of those who legalised Ḥarām and prohibited Ḥalāl?" Give us your Fatwā, may you be rewarded.

Kashf can be of the world or Dīnī matters

Ibn Taymiyah said, "Just as *Kashf* of the worldly matters can be made for the believing slave, whether on a definite or speculative basis, Dīnī matters are similar… Sometimes it is a proof placed in the believer's heart in which further interpretation is impossible… many people of *Kashf* get in their hearts that this food is Ḥarām, or this man is a Kāfir or Fāsiq and there is no apparent proof for these." [v10; p477]

If such words concerning the saints and people of *Kashf* were to come from a Deobandī, contemporary Salafīs would declare him guilty of *Shirk* and *Kufr*. At the very least he would be declared to be an innovator and grave-worshipper. Sadly for them these words come from Shaykhul Islaam, the man who always spoke from Quraan and Sunnah, whose words were true and honest.

Brethren in Dīn! What Ibn Taymiyah said is the exact belief of the noble Ṣūfīs. He spoke with their tongue. In fact, he clarified their belief in such a manner which many others are incapable of.

Let us see what Fatwā the Salafīs will issue in this regard. The essence of what the Imām said is that the Ṣūfīs sometimes do something for which there is no apparent proof from the Quraan or Sunnah, yet but act upon it because of inspiration Allaah casts in their hearts.

It is thus inappropriate for us to hasten to issue a Fatwā against them and wag the tongue of objection. Instead, we are obligated to be patient in their regard, and hand over the matter to Allaah.

Yet will this sink in the brains of the contemporary Salafīs? No, a thousand times no. They are a sect whose thoughts have become fossilised and eyes have been blinded. Darkness upon darkness clouds their hearts. We ask Allaah to guide them and enlighten their eyes that they may refrain from ignorant rulings against Allaah's slaves.

Extra-natural acts may occur to those of abstention and worship

Ibn Taymiyah states in *al-Waṣīyah al-Kubrā*[2] which explains the basic beliefs of Islaam, "Amongst those of you who are abstentious of the world and engage in worship, there are those who have purified states and a pleasing path, and receive *Kashf* and effects." [p 17]

---

[2] Maktabah as-Sunnah ad-Dār as-Salafīyah li Nashril 'Ilm printed it in Cairo. Abū 'Abdillāh Muḥammad bin Ḥamd al-Ḥamūd researched it and attached his comments to it. I have a copy of that print. Ad-Dār as-Salafīyah printed it without realising that it destroys the foundation of Salafīyah. Such is the intelligence of the Salafīs.

O brothers of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah, what is your opinion about this Imām? He regards believing that Allaah's friends who abstain from the world and engage in worship can receive *Kashf* and extra-natural effects, to be a necessary a basic article of faith for Muslims. Is this then a false belief? Is he outside the true faith? Is he on something besides Allaah's guidance?

You certainly know by now after all these explanations what is *Kashf* and enactments and what the Imām's view is. Do you have the capability to declare yourselves free from the Imām, the Shaykh of Islaam and the Muslims, the Proof in Dīn, the leader of the believers? Do you have the capability to expel him from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah?

Is it not amazing that when a Deobandī says something like this he is outside Islaam, but when Ibn Taymiyah says it then he is Shaykhul Islaam and leader of mankind? Is this how you judge, O fair ones?

People receive Kashf of the grave and hear the punishments

The Imām says in his Fatāwā, "Kashf has been made to many people who have heard the voices of those being punished in their graves. They saw them being punished with their own eyes. These narrations are many and well-known." [v4; p296]

O people of justice and fairness, is this not what the Ṣūfīs, whom you label as astray, say? Now what do you say about the august Imām, who is the Imām of the Salafīs and Proof of the Ghayr Muqallids? The Imām does not stop at saying that there are people who hear people being punished in their graves, but he said that there are those who actually *see* the punishment.

People experience while awake what was dreamt

The Imām said in *al-Waṣīyah al-Kubrā*, “Sometimes people experience sights while awake similar to that of one sleeping. He thus sees with his heart that which the sleeper sees. Realities can become shown to him through the witnessing of his heart. All these occur in the world.” [p27]

O people of the Quraan and Sunnah, ponder over the words of the Imām you consider to be most reliable. He believed that Allaah’s friends can see whilst awake what a sleeper sees. Realities are revealed to them through the testimony of their hearts. This is exactly what the Ṣūfīs believe. It is known amongst all people that the sleeper can dream that he is in Jannah; that he is in Hell; that he is with angels; that he is with the souls; that he is speaking with the inhabitants of the grave; that he is in some distant land; that he is in the Ka‘bah; that he is at the Sacred Tomb. A sleeper dreams of many others things. All these can be experienced by people whilst awake as well. Allaah’s slave can witness many realities with his heart. This is according to the belief of Ibn Taymiyah.

According to contemporary Salafīs, such belief is misguidance and deviation from Dīn and Sharī‘ah and is a negation of Imaan. We thus have to ask them, “What is your view on the Imām? Which of the two are upon guidance? You, O brothers or your Imām and leader in Dīn?”

The slave can witness with his heart without need of physical senses

Ibn Taymiyah said, “In the same way there are slaves who can witness with the heart, so much so that the physical senses are negated and he perceives it to be a vision of the physical eyes.” [*al-Waṣīyah*; p 27]

That is the same as the belief of the Ṣūfīs, but you say that whoever believes that is outside the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah. You, O Salafī brothers, regard such as person as a nonsensical Ṣūfī. What then, O true believers, is you opinion on the Imām of the Ahlus Sunnah? He made this matter to be a basic point of belief in Dīn and Sharī‘ah. Did he speak nonsense or was he soiled with *Shirk* and inviting to innovation?

How ignorant you are on the beliefs of your own Imām! It is as if you never cast a glance at his writings and beliefs. You claim the love of Laylā, but Laylā does not acknowledge it. Return to guidance and do not sow corruption on earth. Do not destroy yourselves by attacking the Ṣūfīs whom Allaah has distinguished. Do not seek to grieve Allaah and His Rasūl ρ by harming and being enemies to them.

The Nabī ρ and some pious are alive in the graves and can hear

In his book *Iqtiḍāuṣ Ṣirāṭil Mustaqīm*, Ibn Taymiyah strongly refutes those who deny that du‘ā near the graves of Rasulullaah ρ and the pious may be more likely to be accepted due to their blessings. He adds similar such words and explicitly says, “It is not part of this topic what has been narrated in regards some people hearing a return of their greeting from the tomb of the Nabī ρ or the graves of others amongst the pious. Indeed Sa‘īd bin al-Musayyib heard the Aẓān from the grave during the nights of al-Ḥarrah. [p373]

Is this not an explicit admission from the Imām that Rasulullaah ρ is alive in his grave and returns Salām and that Aẓān is heard from his grave? In the same way others are alive in their graves. What a denial of reality to deny the life of the Ambiyaa and pious in their graves after Ibn Taymiyah verified it.

Rasulullaah ρ hears complaints in his grave and plans to assist

He wrote in the same book, "In the same way it is narrated that a man came to the Nabī's ρ grave and complained about drought. He then had a vision of him and he ordered him to go to 'Umar and tell him to go with the people and perform Istisqā'." [p373]

Think about it, O noble reader, these are the words of Shaykhul Islaam. Are they not clear that Rasulullaah ρ is alive in his grave and hears complaints? That he plans from his grave to alleviate these problems? That people have vision of him whilst he is in his Noble Grave? If Rasulullaah ρ is not alive, then do dead people hear, command and plan to remove difficulties? Is it not to deny reality when one denies that he is alive despite having to accept these facts? As for Allaah's words, "Verily you will die and they will die…" it simply means that no human will remain eternally on the face of the earth. Just as the disbelievers will not remain eternally on earth, in the same way, you O Muḥammad will not remain eternally on earth. How is this a denial of him being alive in his grave? The grave is another world completely. Its conditions are not the conditions of this world. If Allaah wishes to grant his Ambiyaa life in their graves then what obstruction is there to that? People with insight and intact intelligence will not deny that Ambiyaa are alive in their graves. Yes, their lives in the graves are different to their earthly lives in many ways. Nevertheless, it is a life which entails awareness, hearing, planning and assisting people. This is the belief of the pious Imām.

What the Imām said is in fact the belief of the Ṣūfīs, 'Ulamā' of Deoband and the overwhelming majority of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah. They do not add anything to that in regards their belief in the life of the Ambiyaa.

Despite his belief that Rasūlullaah ρ is alive in his grave, Ibn Taymiyah is the Imām of the Ahlus Sunnah and Shaykhul Islaam. Yet you Salafīs, despite following him in the "straight Maẓhab" and

claiming to be the people of Imaan, recognition, Quraan and Ḥadīth, amaze us at the state of your justice, Dīn and trust.

After declaring that Rasūlullaah ρ is dead in grave and falsely states that such belief is the unanimous belief of the Ahlus Sunnah, the author of, "*Are the 'Ulamā' of the Deobandī sect of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah?*" asks, "Issue your Fatwā on one who does not accept the unanimity of the Ṣaḥābah, that how can such a person belong to the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah?" [p35]

Indeed, how *can* such a person belong to the Ahlus Sunnah? If Ibn Taymiyah is your Imām in the Ahlus Sunnah, then at the least he is of the Ahlus Sunnah. Your question should be directed more at him than at us Deobandīs. Eather you have no sense, your eyes are blind, your heart is darkened or your have lost aall sense of shame.

The dead hearing is seeking help from them is not specific to Rasūlullaah ρ

Ibn Taymiyah said on the same page, "Similar occurrences happen to those less than the Nabī ρ and I know many such incidents." [p 373]

The words of the Shaykh are absolutely clear. They leave no scope for interpretation. There are many Friends of Allaah who hear and help are sought from them when they are alive in their graves.

Do the Ṣūfīs say anything different? If such belief about the saints and Ambiyaa in their graves is *Kufr* and *Shirk*, it is obligatory upon the Salafīs to denounce Ibn Taymiyah and renounce him as the Imām of the Quraan and Sunnah. They must decree him guilty of *Kufr* and *Shirk*. They then have to repent and renew their faith because they had made a man guilty of *Kufr* and *Shirk* as their Imām in belief.

"Allaah will complete His light even if the disbelievers dislike it."

The dead hears the Quraan in his grave

Ibn Taymiyah wrote in his book *Iqtiḍāuṣ Ṣirāṭil Mustaqīm*, “As for the dead hearing the voices reciting, it is true…”

This is the exact belief of the Grave-Worshippers, innovators and those outside the pale of the Ahlus Sunnah. In fact, of every person who is not a Salafī for such is the way of the Salafī sect. So dear Salafī brothers, what is your view on the Imām of the Ahlus Sunnah according to you?

How regrettable that contemporary Salafīs weigh matters with two different scales. This is certainly not justice in the Dīn which our Rasūl ρ brought.

One who brings a new thing with a good intention is rewarded

Ibn Taymiyah said, “Similarly when some people bring about, whether it resembles the Christians in the Birth of ‘Īsā υ or out of love and honour for the Nabī ρ, Allaah will reward them for their love and effort, not for the innovation of celebrating the birth of the Nabī ρ as a festival.” [*Iqtiḍāuṣ Ṣirāṭil Mustaqīm*; p294]

If we were to accept the Shaykh’s words, then by Allaah, the foundation of Dīn would be destroyed. An innovation in Dīn remains an innovation even if the innovator claims to have a good intention and is honouring the Nabī ρ. **We have no idea how the Imām of the Ahlus Sunnah could utter such words.**

If the contemporary Salafīs regard these words as true – after all, they are the words of their Imām and leader – then we demand that they

present proof for it from the Quraan, Ḥadīth or sayings of the Ṣaḥābah ψ or even the Fuqahā' or Muḥaddithūn.

As for us, these words resemble that of innovators and grave-worshippers. They are words whispered by the Devil, not words of people of Quraan and Ḥadīth. Through these words Ibn Taymiyah opened the doors of misguidance. He falsified in Allaah's Dīn what none of 'Ulamā' of the Ahlus Sunnah dared do. None of the Ṣaḥābah ψ, Tābi'īn, Aimmah, Fuqahā' and Muḥaddithūn ever said anything like that. Alas! What is the condition of Islaam? Where are the heroes of the contemporary Salafīs in regards this belief of their leader in Dīn? Do we not have a right to question them just as they question us – is your Imām Ibn Taymiyah part of the Ahlus Sunnah or not?

What adds to our astonishment is that Ibn Taymiyah then repeats this statement without any care on p297 of that book, "Honouring the birth and making it an annual festival is what some people do and in that there is great reward for them because of their good aim and honouring Rasūlullaah ρ."

SubḥānAllaah! Is this the statement of one in whose heart Quraanic light has been cast or the whispers of devils? Give us your Fatwā, O Salafīs. May you be rewarded. Where now are all those warnings of Rasūlullaah ρ against innovation which you are supposed to be more particular about than us Deobandīs?

O Allaah, bear witness. If I were walking a path like the Salafīs tread in reviling our elders and 'Ulamā' I would fully refute that statement and attacking the one who uttered it. **However, I believe that Ibn Taymiyah made a mistake when he wrote that, and meant something good and will be rewarded. As the saying goes, "One who does a lot has to slip up." He who never falls in the field is not a true hero.** We seek Allaah's protection against the evils of the ego and Satan. There is no ability to avoid evil and no power to do good except through Allaah Almighty.

The author of "*Are the 'Ulamā' of the Deobandī sect from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah*?" is the most ignorant person and greatest liar. He concocts beliefs and attributes them to the Mashāikh of Deoband. He wrote, "Look O people of Islaam, at these beliefs of the Deobandīs." He does the same as the Barelwīs, may Allaah curse them. His style in concocting beliefs is to relate a miracle from a book of one of the Mashāikh of Deoband and then comments, "This is the belief of the Deobandīs…" i.e. he builds the beliefs upon the stories of miracles. **The ignoramus does not know that miracles are in nobody's school the basis of ideology. Beliefs are based upon conviction, not thoughts. It is but possibilities which arise from miracles.**

Kashf and miracles are possible from Allaah's friends but these are not a means of convincing knowledge according to any of the 'Ulamā' of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah. Stories of *Kashf* and miracles are never the basis for belief.

If the Salafīs, and the above author with them, insist that stories of miracles and *Kashf* were used as the basis for beliefs, then what is their Fatwā on their Imām, Ibn Taymiyah? For that is what he says in the eleventh volume of his *Fatāwā*.

Life and death are in the slave's hands

Ibn Taymiyah said, "al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī prayed against a Khārijī who was troubling him and he fell down dead." [p280]

Would the Salafīs like it if we said about Ibn Taymiyah that he believed that a slave has the power of life and death in his hands because he mentions this miracle in his Fatāwā and viewed it as real. He wrote on the same page, "The horse of Ṣalt bin Ashyam died whilst he was on a campaign. He then prayed, 'O Allaah, do not make me dependant upon creation.' He asked Allaah *'azza wa jalla* Who resurrected his horse for him.' When he returned home he said,

'O my son, take the horse's saddle because it was a loan.' He took the saddle and the horse died."

I ask the people of knowledge, is it permissible to believe concerning Ibn Ashyam on whose hands Allaah had shown a miracle in answering his du'ā, that he controlled life and death? Or can we say that Ibn Taymiyah believed that a human can control life and death and he had knowledge of the unseen, because Ibn Ashyam knew that the horse would die upon reaching home. Would it now be permissible for someone to expel him from the Ahlus Sunnah? Yes, it will be permissible if that person walks the path of the Salafīs.

In this regard Ibn Taymiyah mentioned many miracles which the saints performed. These include:

A man from the Nakha' tribe had a donkey which died during a journey. His companions said, "Come let us move his baggage onto our mounts." He told them, "Give a little chance." He then performed an excellent Wuḍū', offered Ṣalāh and asked Allaah, Who resurrected his donkey. It then continued carrying his goods." [Chapter 1, Fatawa 11; p 299]

What do our Salafī brothers think about this miracle? What do they think of someone who thinks that such miracles are true and mentions them in his writings? Is he of the Ahlus Sunnah or not? If the response is yes, then I ask how can that be, when miracles such as these are *Kufr* and *Shirk* according to you, and the believer in them loses his Imaan and is expelled from the Ahlus Sunnah?

If the answer is in the negative, then was Ibn Taymiyah a liar in describing these miracles and in attributing them to the pious? Did he concoct this himself?

You O treaders of the Path of Guidance and only true believers, have one of two options. Either you expel your Imām Ibn Taymiyah from the Ahlus Sunnah, or you issue a Fatwā that he was a liar. Yes dear

brothers who attack the Mashāikh of Deoband, these are your two choices. There is no third choice. Choose whichever you wish.

Ibn ‘Umar τ was an innovator according to Ibn Taymiyah

Ibn Taymiyah wrote in *Iqtiḍāuṣ Ṣirāṭil Mustaqīm*, “As for deliberately offering Ṣalāh in that spot where the Nabī incidentally performed Ṣalāh, it is not quoted from any Ṣaḥābī besides Ibn ‘Umar. It would appear that this is not a Sunnah of the Khulāfā’ Rāshiḍun, but his own innovation.” [p29]

Rasūlullaah ρ had said, “Beware of bringing new things in matters, for every new thing is an innovation and every innovation is misguidance.” Thus according to Ibn Taymiyah, Ibn ‘Umar τ is an innovator and misguided.

By Allāḥ, when I read these words of Ibn Taymiyah in *Iqtiḍāuṣ Ṣirāṭil Mustaqīm*, the hairs of my body rose. How poor in shame and how copious in audacity is he in regards to the Ṣaḥābah ψ. They are the ones whom Rasūlullaah ρ had taught Dīn directly. He informed them what is Sunnah and what is innovation in Sharī‘ah; what is truth and what is misguidance; what is Ḥalaal and what is Ḥarām. The Ṣaḥābah ψ followed Rasūlullaah ρ to the “T” and were most zealous is obeying his Sunnah.

As the people of knowledge know, Ibn ‘Umar τ was distinguished amongst the Ṣaḥābah ψ for his following of every Sunnah, great or less. He would not leave anything Rasūlullaah ρ did, said or guided towards.

Is it not utterly astonishing that according to Ibn Taymiyah, Ibn ‘Umar τ became an innovator, when at the same time he said that one gets rewarded for innovations if he had a good intention.

Perhaps the distinguished scholar forgot this saying of Rasūlullaah ρ, "Fear Allaah! Fear Allaah in regard my Companions. Do not make them a target after me."

At this point I wish to quote what al-Ḥāfizh aẓ-Ẓahabī mentioned with regard to Ibn Taymiyah in *Zaghlul 'Ilm*, "I find no reason for his fall amongst the peoples of Egypt and Syria and them hating him, disassociating from him, belying him and denying him, except his pride, vanity, extremism against the Mashāikh and disassociation from the seniors." [p17]

By Allaah, those words are most certainly true. Ibn Taymiyah was like that. He was averse to the seniors, even the Ṣaḥābah ψ. I wish to ask Ibn Taymiyah, if Ibn 'Umar's τ act was an innovation without any basis in Sharī'ah, then why did the other Ṣaḥābah ψ not deny him and prevent him from that? Why did they keep quiet? Why did the Khulafā' Rāshiḍun not say anything about him? Would it not have been their duty to refute this "bad" act? Is Ibn Taymiyah, or anyone from his group able to produce a single shred of evidence that never mind the Khulafā' Rāshidūn ψ, but did even any one Ṣaḥābī τ, denounce Ibn 'Umar's τ act, or did they all remain silent?

One who believes that the Ṣaḥābah witnessed evil in their midst and kept silent is without doubt outside the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah, because he believes that the Ṣaḥābah ψ did not fulfil a Shar'ī obligation. On the other hand, Allāḥ says, "The believing male and females are protectors unto each other. They order the good and forbid the bad."

The statement of Ibn Taymiyah concerning Ibn 'Umar τ is of the same category of his statement on journeying to visit the Grave of Rasūlullaaḥ ρ. Ibn Taymiyah regarded such a journey as forbidden and sinful and such a traveller is not permitted to perform *Qaṣr* [shortening] of his Ṣalāh. Rasūlullaah ρ said, "Do not set out on a journey, except for three Masājid…" Ibn

Taymiyah quoted the Ḥadīth without knowing what exactly was Rasūlullaah ρ prohibiting.

Ibn Ḥajar wrote in *Fatḥul Bārī*, "This is amongst the ugliest rulings attributed to him."

To make Zikr of "Allaah" alone is an innovation

Amongst the concocted beliefs of Ibn Taymiyah is this what he wrote in his *Fatāwā*, "Ẓikr of *al-Ism al-Mufrad* [Name of Allaah alone] whether explicitly or by way of pronoun is an innovation in Sharī'ah." [V10, p396]

In which Sharī'ah might this be? In the Sharī'ah of Ibn Taymiyah? Certainly not in the Sharī'ah of Muḥammad ρ! Ibn Taymiyah assumed the ultimate in arrogance in appropriating the right to Ḥalāl and Ḥarām. Allowing what he willed and forbidding what he willed is the way of the 'Ulamā' of Banū Isrāīl. He imposes his opinion on Dīn and opposes the permissibility on which the Muslims are unanimous.

If this *Ẓikr* is an innovation, then let Ibn Taymiyah present proof that it is forbidden from the Quraan or Ḥadīth or a saying of the Ṣaḥābah ψ or the Imāms of Fiqh and Ḥadīth. Otherwise he should have abstained from pronouncing his opinion over Dīn. Apparently Ibn Taymiyah was deaf to the verse, "Verily by the Ẓikr of Allaah do hearts find contentment." For in this verse "Allaah" is mentioned on its own and is not attached to anything else. This is the most explicit proof on its permissibility. Allaah says, "To Allāḥ belongs the Most Beautiful Names, so call unto Him through it." Allaah also says, "Call unto Allaah or call unto ar-Raḥmān. Whichever you call, to Him belongs the Most Beautiful Names." Ibn Taymiyah made himself blind to all these āyāt when he forbade this Ẓikr. **He expressed a personal opinion opposed to unanimous decision.**

According to him and according to the majority of Muslims, consensus is proof in itself.

It is indeed a big joke that Ibn Taymiyah sought proof from this in a way which common people would not have stooped to. He used the Aḥādīth which narrate the virtue of the words, "*SubḥānAllaah wal ḥamdu lillāh wAllaahu akbar*." Such is his intelligence and understanding of Dīn. There is no ability to avoid evil and no power to do good except with Almighty Allaah."

What relationship does the former bear with the latter? Yes, had Rasūlullaah ρ forbidden the Ẓikr of the word, "Allaah," then there would have been substance to Ibn Taymiyah's prohibition. However, there is no such prohibition substantiated from Rasulullaah ρ or his Ṣaḥābah ψ. From where then did Ibn Taymiyah manage to declare this Ẓikr to be a prohibited innovation when it is proven from the Quraan? Is this not concocting Dīn according to one's opinion?

As for his stating in his *Fatāwā* that this *Ẓikr* is not narrated from any Ṣaḥābī τ, is the absence of the mentioning proof of its prohibition, or that it was never existent amongst them? Such is the intelligence of Ibn Taymiyah and his understanding of Dīn. Has everything been narrated to us what they did in private and public? I present this question to Ibn Taymiyah with full respect. If he cannot prove that the Ṣaḥābah ψ when following the Imām said, "Allaahu Akbar," softly then how can Ibn Taymiyah say, "Allaahu Akbar," in his Ṣalāh, whether softly or loudly? I demand that he or anyone from his sect present a single shred of evidence that any of the Ṣaḥābah ψ or the Salaf said it loudly or softly. If that cannot be proven, then would his Fatwā be that it has no Shar'ī basis for reciting it in Ṣalāh? If it is not proven, then what did the Nabī ρ and his Ṣaḥābah ψ recite? We await the reply of Ibn Taymiyah and his party.

Such kind of statements such as Ibn Taymiyah's belief on this Ẓikr are mere baseless opinions.

Rasulullaah ρ was the Lawgiver with power of allowing and prohibiting

Ibn Taymiyah stated in his *Fatāwā*, “The Rasūl must be obeyed and loved. Ḥalāl is what he permitted. Ḥarām is what he forbade. Dīn is what he prescribed.” [v10; p466]

I ask you, O Salafī brothers who are drowned in their love for Ibn Taymiyah, if this is the statement of people of the Sunnah? Is this the Maẓhab of the Predecessors? Did the Ṣaḥābah ψ say this? **Or is Ibn Taymiyah speaking here with the tongue of the innovating Barelwīs who are outside the pale of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah?** For it is the Barelwīs who say that Dīn is what the Rasūl ρ prescribed, forbade and permitted. They thus attribute the authority of permitting and prohibiting unto him. Thus Rasulullaah ρ is the True Lawgiver according to them. Ibn Taymiyah seems to be with them on this.

On the other hand, according to the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah the Real Lawgiver is Allaah Ta‘ālā alone Who has no partner whether in lawgiving or creation. The authority of Ḥalāl and Ḥarām belongs to Him alone. Rasulullaah ρ was the conveyor from Him Most High.

If I wished to criticise Ibn Taymiyah I would just be wasting my breathe refuting that belief, because **it is my belief that that statement was an error on his part. It is rare that those who do much are free fro slip-ups.**

If he deliberately meant it, then it is baseless *Shirk* which has no proof from the Quraan and Ḥadīth. Ash-Shaykh Ḥabībur Raḥmān al-A‘zhamī had written “*ash-Shāri‘ al-Ḥaqīqī*,” on this topic. In it he describes the reality as per the belief of the majority of Muslims and mentions their proofs from the Quraan and Ḥadīth.

The Nubūwah of our Nabī ρ is the origin of the Nubūwah of the other Ambiyaa

The author of "*Are the 'Ulamā' of the Deobandī sect from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah*?" made an all-out effort in his ignorance to make people lose affection for ash-Shaykh Qāsim an-Nānotwī, the founder of *Dārul 'Ulūm*, the famous university at Deoband. In doing that he imitated the style of the misguided, innovator and grave-worshipper, Arshad al-Qādirī, of the Barelwī sect. He strove to incite people against the Imām in regards his statement that the Prphethood of Muḥammad ρ is original and the Prohethood of the other Ambiyaa stems from the effulgence of his *Nubūwah*. That also means that he is the Seal of the Ambiyaa, from the first of them to the last, in aspects of personality, time and place. Even if in theory there should have been a prophet after him, that would have no effect on his Finality, because his Nubūwah is vested in himself originally whilst the others stem from his effulgence.

There is no doubt that that statement is correct. It is the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah. It is from Rasulullaah ρ that the chain of Nubūwah originated. He was the Nabī from primordial times and was already then the Seal of Ambiyaa by the decree of Allaah, before even the presence of the creation, before there was time and place, before any Nabī came to the world.

Sadly, the author of the booklet did not understand this subtle meaning due to his ignorance and enmity against the Deobandīs. He thus spewed against ash-Shaykh an-Nānotwī what he spewed and his tongue spoke like a devil.

The statement of ash-Shaykh an-Nānotwī is in fact in the same style as that Ibn Taymiyah. He presented his argument based on the Quraan and Ḥadīth, in a style and division modern intelligence can understand.

If the author of the booklet has any intelligence then he should listen very carefully to what Ḥujjatul Islaam wrote. Ibn Taymiyah wrote, “There is no Nabī in Jannah except that it began with the Nabī ρ and passed down to others. He is the unconditional Imām of guidance from the beginning of Banū Ādam until the last of them.” [*al-Fatāwā*: v10; p727]

“He is the Intercessor of the first ones and the last ones in their Reckoning. He will be the first to seek the opening of Jannah’s Gate.” [ibid: p728]

“That is because Allaah took an oath from all creation to believe in him.” [Ibid: p728]

“Ibn ‘Abbās said that Allaah never sent a Nabī except that he made him pledge that if he sent Muḥammad and he was still alive, he would believe in him and assist him.” [ibid]

“The Nabī ρ said, ‘Indeed I was according to Allaah the Seal of the Ambiyaa while Ādam was still in a state of earth.’” [ibid]

“Allaah wrote and decreed at that time, and in that state commanded before the progeny.” [v10; p729]

Think O ‘Ulāmā, do these words not mean that Rasulullaah ρ is the origin of the Chapter of Nubuwah? That the Nubūwaat of the others gush from this original spring? That theirs grew from his just as twigs grow from a tree’s branch, the twigs then sprout leaves whilst the branch remains standing?

That is the meaning of the words of our august Imām, Muḥammad Qāsim an-Nānotwī, “Indeed our Nabī Muḥammad ρ is Allaah’s Nabī in terms of personality, whilst the Nubūwah of other Ambiyaa *‘alyhimus salām* is the effulgence of his Nubūwah ρ. He being the Seal of the Ambiyaa, in personality, time and place, there would be

no harm to his Nubūwaat if in theory there were to be another Nabi in the era after him ρ.”

This is a very delicate meaning which only those will understand who have insight and intact intelligence and Allaah has filled their hearts with His light. As for those whose share is but ignorance and lack of understanding, how can they possibly understand such delicate meanings?

Ambiyaa are not innocent of sin

The most dangerous belief of Ibn Taymiyah is, I believe, the belief that the Ambiyaa are not *ma‘ṣūm* [innocent] of sin and disobedience, whether minor or major. According to him the *‘Iṣmah* [innocence] of the Ambiyaa is confined to what they relate from Allaah, that they do not repeatedly sin or remain upon a sin. It does not mean as the Ahlus Sunnah believe, that they never commit any sin.

He wrote in the tenth volume of his *Fatāwā*, “The Ambiyaa – may Allaah’s salutations be upon them – are *Ma‘ṣūm* in terms of what they relate from Allaah and conveying His messages.” [p289]

“The aims of Nubūwah and Risālah are achieved through this *‘Iṣmah* which is established for the Ambiyaa.” [p290]

He introduces this word a bit saying, “The *‘Iṣmah* through which they convey from Allaah is established, thus there is no error remaining in the conveying.” [p290]

Dear reader, do you fully understand the import of Ibn Taymiyah’s words? He claims that the Ambiyaa were not entirely free from sin as is the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah. Instead, they were only free from sin in regards the conveying of their message. As for

complete *‘Iṣmah* from sins and disobedience, that is not the belief of Ibn Taymiyah.

To further clarify Ibn Taymiyah’s belief on the *‘Iṣmah* of the Ambiyaa, listen to the following words of his and ponder over the “…but…”

He wrote, “But does Allaah reach him and erase what the Devil cast and thus establish His verses? There are two views in this matter. What has been narrated from the Predecessors agrees with the Quraan.” [v10; p291]

That means that according to Ibn Taymiyah, the narrations from the Predecessors establish that the Ambiyaa *‘alayhimus salām* are not free from satanic misguidance. Satan casts unto them that which is not from Allaah. Allaah then erases that and establishes His verses. This is what “agrees” with the Quraan.

If you need more clarity then listen to these words which have many distortions, “As for *‘Iṣmah* which has nothing to do with conveying the Message, is it proven from intelligence or is it even heard of? Is it from Major and minor sins? Or some of them? Or from repeating them? Or is it that *‘Iṣmah* is not necessary except in conveying? Is *‘Iṣmah* from Kufr and sins necessary before Prophethood or not?” [v10; p293]

Look at this man. He turns the issue of *‘iṣmah*, which is an agreed upon issue amongst the Ahlus Sunnah, into a disputed issue. There is but one view that they are innocent of all sins after becoming Ambiyaa. According to some, they are innocent of major sins as well, before Nubūwah, but not of minor sins. **Yet the overall view of the Ahlus Sunnah is that they are innocent of both major and minor sins, both before and after Nubūwah.**

After these statements, Ibn Taymiyah clarifies his belief on the *‘Iṣmah* of the Ambiyaa *alayhimus salām*, “The view which the

majority hold and is narrated from the *Salaf* {Predecessors] is that *'Iṣmah* is confined to innocence from repeating sins in general." [v10; p293]

This is a lie against the *Salaf* and against the majority. They are free of such a corrupt belief which contradicts the Quraan and Ḥadīth. Allaah says, "We found you *ḍāll* – meaning here unaware – and then We guided [you]." How can one whom Allaah guides and chooses for His Message, commit sins? Allaah mentions a number of Ambiyaa *alayhimus salām* and then says, "Follow their guidance." Will Allaah order the purest of His creation and most virtuous of His Messengers to follower those who commit sins? Allaah said to Satan, "Verily you will have no power over My Slaves." So which of Allaah's Slaves are more noble and virtuous than the Ambiyaa *alayhimus salām*, that he can then throw them into sinning and turn them from guidance? Disobedience and sins are nothing but the effects of Satan exerting power over Allaah's Slaves.

Ibn Taymiyah's belief about Yūnus υ

Since Ibn Taymiyah did not believe in the innocence of the Ambiyaa, he wrote on that basis in regards Yūnus υ, "Ẓun Nūn [Yūnus υ] witnessed the consequences of his deficiency in the Divine right when he became angry and displeased that they should be saved. In that he presented an act which was preferring something else to what was obligatory upon him in terms of only loving Him and accepting Him as his god. By then saying, "There is no god but You," he recited the statement by which the slave erases taking his god his desires. It has been narrated, 'There is nothing under the sky which Allaah regards as worse to worship than following one's desires.' Yūnus, Allaah's salutations be upon him, thus perfected the reality of declaring his god and erased the desires which he had made a god besides Him." [v10; p287]

O Slaves of Allaah! Look at that! O 'Ulamā' what prattle is this which the Imām of the Salafīs says about our chief, Yūnus υ, whom Allaah had selected for Nubūwah? Tell us, O noble ones. Are these the words of a scholar of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah? Who before this Shaykh uttered such words against a Nabī of Allaah? Ibn Taymiyah prattles and does not know what emerges from his mouth. **According to him, Yūnus υ was deficient in divine rights and made his desires his god, which is the worst associate unto Allaah under the sky.**

These words are clear that the Imām of the Salafīs believed that Ambiyaa could commit the worst of sins, so the extent that they were not innocent of setting their desires as their gods.

I ask the Salafī brothers, does their Imām remain a believer after uttering such words? Never mind, whether he is the Imām of the Muslims and Ḥujjatul Islaam. **As for us, the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah, such belief is undoubtedly *Kufr* and the one who utters that is certainly left Imaan.**

We ask Allaah to save us from evil beliefs concerning His sincere slaves from the Ambiyaa, Rusul, and pious *Salaf*; and that He resurrect us, the Deobandīs, with them, through the blessings of the Chief of all Messengers ρ[3].

When it was said to Ibn Taymiyah that sins negate perfection and are a denial of the bounty, he replied, "That is when there is remaining upon that without turning away. On the other hand, sincere repentance which **Allaah accepts is the means by which He raises the repentant to a greater state then what he was upon.** [v10; p293]

[3] Such words of mediation is permissible according to the Salafīs as well. In the sketch of Ibn 'Arabī in *at-Tāj al-Mukallil,* an-Nawwāb al-Bhopālī ends with those words.

This is an explicit statement that Ibn Taymiyah did not believe in the *'Iṣmah* of the Ambiyaa *'aalyhimus salām*. The strange thing about this reply which indicates the low intelligence and lack of understanding of Dīn of the man is that he says that sincere repentance erases sins and raises the repentant to greater status. Well, one does not have to be a Nabī for that. It applies to any person of Imaan. What distinction then remains for the Ambiyaa? What distinguishing them in regards sins?

Events affect the Being of Allaah

According to all the 'Ulamā' of the Ahlus Sunnah, Allaah's Being cannot be affected by external events. The early and latter generations were unanimous about that. Ibn Taymiyah was however of a different view. According to him, not only is it possible that events can affect Allaah's Being, this actually does occur. He wrote in the fifth volume of his *Fatāwā*, "From this a second principle becomes apparent in regards the *Azalī* [primordial] and *Muta'addī* [transcending] acts of the Rabb. It is that are voluntary acts related to His power and will applicable to Him or not? The Maẓhab of the Salaf and Aimmah of Ḥadīth is that it is possible." [p536]

He also wrote, "As for His nearness and approaching Him on the part of some Slaves, This is established by those who establish His voluntary acts by His Being, His coming *Yawmul Qiyāmah*, His descending and His Mounting the Throne. This is the Maẓhab of the Aimmah of the Salaf, the famous Aimmah of Islaam and the people of Ḥadīth. Narration from them to that effect is *mutawātir* [continuous and known]. [p466]

He also wrote, "These say that He comes, descends, mounts and other such acts just as He informed about His Being and this is perfection." [v8; p20]

In this way, Ibn Taymiyah continued establishing events for the Being of Allaah. He does not know that one who is affected by events cannot be *Qadīm* [Primordial]. **Allaah's Being is *Qadīm*. He does not need anything. How then is His Being affected by events?**

He attributes to Allaah voluntary acts such as climbing, descending, mounting, laughing, moving, keeping still, etc according to their literal meanings. Thereafter he says that voluntary acts for Allaah are different than that for creatures because Allaah is not like anything.

This is nothing but sheer nonsense which people of knowledge do not utter. If you declare these acts to be established for Allaah according to the literal meaning, then you have made Allaah partners with His creation in the original meaning. How can there be any comparison to the original meaning? For example, the original meaning of descending is to move from one place to another. So Aḥmad for example descends in this meaning and Allaah also descends in this meaning? Is there a comparison or is Aḥmad and Allaah's Being the same in the meaning of descending? As for Ibn Taymiyah then saying that Allaah's descending is different to the creation descending despite their being a commonality in the original meaning of descending, there is nothing special in that for Allaah. The descending of Bakr is different to the descending of 'Amr. Bakr's climbing is different to 'Amr's climbing. Bakr's mounting is different to 'Amr's mounting. These, despite the commonality of these acts in their original meaning.

One who concocts his own Maẓhab will inevitably fall into such prattle. **He falsely attributes his Maẓhab to the Saalf in order to deceive the people and misguide them from the Straight Path.**

Finally, I ask fair and just 'Ulamā', "Can we fairly consider to be part of the Ahlus Sunnah someone who believes that events affect the Being of Allaah?"

Ambiyaa do not attain perfection except at their end

Amongst the filthy beliefs of Ibn Taymiyah is that the Ambiyaa do not attain perfection, except at their end, not at their beginning. Listen well to his statement, “The aim here is that all that is blameworthy upon Ẓūn Nūn as demonstrated by the story, is forgiven and Allaah changed them to good deeds and raised his status. After his emergence from the fish’s belly and his repentance, he was greater in status than before he fell into what he fell.” [v10; p299]

He also wrote, “His state after saying, ‘*Lā ilāha illā Anta, Subḥānaka, innī kuntu minazh zhālimīn,*’ was higher than that his state before what had happened. Regard is paid to what the end is, not what happened in the beginning. Actions are according to their completion.” [v10; p299]

He also wrote, “Allaah created Man and took him from his mother, not knowing anything. He then taught him. He thus moved him from a state of deficiency to a state of perfection. It is thus not permissible to examine the worth of Man before he reached the state of perfection. Regard is at the state of perfection. **Yūnus ρ and other Ambiyaa attained the most perfect at their end. [v10; p299]**

O Muslims! Say in Allaah’s Name if this is the belief of any of the Salaf or Aimmah of Quraan and Ḥadīth in regards the Ambiyaa *‘alayhimus salām*? Have your ears ever heard such a statement from any of the Ṣaḥābah ψ or Tābi‘ūn? Inform me, for you are Allaah’s witnesses upon earth. Has the pen any of the Ahlus Sunnah ever written something like that in regards those whom Allaah chose?

Who from amongst the Salafi ever stated that the Ambiyaa are perfect at the end and deficient at the beginning, and that their state is like when emerging from their mothers and then they attain perfection as time passes?

You, O Salafīs, are upon the belief system of your Imām, so are you from the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah? If you sufficed with what was with you, instead of casting against the 'Ulāmā' of Deoband, it would have been better for you. It is good for people to ponder of their own states instead of attacking others.

Respected brother, if we were to accept this statement of Ibn Taymiyah, then we would have to say that none of the Ambiyaa attained perfection even at his end. The reason being that had his age been longer than what it actually was, would his perfection and Imān not have increased?

Ibn Taymiyah is astray in this belief and has gone far away from the way of guidance in innovating a belief in Dīn which is purely his opinion. Nobody from the Ahlus Sunnah has believed that. It has not been narrated from the Ṣaḥābah ψ or Tābi'ūn. He faslsely ascribed this false *Kufr* belief to them and lied against them.

Mu'āẓ τ was more learned than 'Alī τ

Ibn Taymiyah wrote in his *Fatāwā*, "His statement, 'The most learned of them in regards Ḥalaal and Ḥarām is Mu'āẓ bin Jabal,' is closer to authenticity according to the 'Ulamā' of Ḥadīth than his statement, 'The best judge amongst you is 'Alī,' if it in fact can be used as proof. Thus if that is more authentic as per chain of narration and clearer proof, then the one who uses the other as an argument that 'Alī is more learned than Mu'āẓ bin Jabal is an ignoramus." [v4; p41]

This is another example of his ignorance and misguidance. It is the belief of the Ahlus Sunnah that 'Alī τ was more virtuous and learned than Mu'āẓ bin Jabal τ.

Ibn Taymiyah's habit was to concoct something and then shamelessly attribute it to the majority and the Salaf; the Quraan

and Ḥadīth. Actually it is not amazing that he said something like this. He was overzealous in seeking to find fault with the son-in-law of Rasulullaah ρ. Whoever wants further details on that, should read his book, *Minhājus Sunnah*.

No believer attained complete guidance – even Ambiyaa and Ṣaḥābah ψ

In regards the āyah, "And what is wrong with you that you do not believe in Allaah, whereas the Rasūl calls you to believe in your Rabb and indeed took your pledge, if indeed you are believers," Ibn Taymiyah commented that it is the believers who being addressed and Allaah desires from them that they perfect their faith and fulfil what is obligatory upon them.

"Just as we ask Allaah to guide us on the Straight Path in every Ṣalāh, whereas He has guided the believers to accept all that the Rasūl brought; but complete guidance is in everything that they say and do in all their affairs. It is this complete and perfect guidance which is the faith which is commanded. Through that, He takes them out from the darknesses unto the light." [v7; p231]

See what nonsense does your Imām utter, in what valley of darkness is he blind, is what misguidance he fell.

Does any Muslim - whom Allaah has blessed with the faith that Allaah made the Ṣaḥābah ψ, Tābi'ūn, Ambiyaa and Rusul from those whom Satan has no power over – believe such a thing? He placed them upon the Straight Path and perfect guidance. He removed them from darkness from their very first day. They were attributed with the Imaan which is commanded. They were lights from which beams of guidance and Imaan shone and lit the world, and from which the astray found guidance in every place. No, a Muslim will never say such a thing. A thousand times no.

However, according to Ibn Taymiyah, these select ones were not perfect believers of perfect guidance. Instead, they were in darkness. What kind of intelligence and understanding of Dīn did this man have? He whom Allaah allows to be misguided will have no guide. He for whom Allaah has not made light will have no light.

Conclusion

This was a glance at some of beliefs of Shaykhul Islaam Ibn Taymiyah, leader of the Salafīs, their proof for Islaam. It was a glance at some of his thoughts and opinions in Dīn. There are many other examples to be found in his writings and compilations. I have sufficed with this amount and do not wish for more than that. The aim was no complete encompassing or prolongation, but to shed light on some of the Salafī beliefs which they assume to originate from Quraan and Ḥadīth. It was to clarify truth from falsehood to the brothers, and the reality of their claim that they belong to the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā'ah and that they alone will be the saved sect out of the 73; that they are the people of Quraan and Ḥadīth and Imaan and Islaam and the rest of the Muslims in the world are astray, Mushrikūn, innovators and grave-worshippers; in fact apostates behind whom Ṣalāh is not permissible and with whom marriage is not permissible.

Through the grace of Allaah this aim has been achieved in the best and most clear manner. The beliefs and the ways of the Salafīs have become apparent to the people.

I was forced to write these lines and this booklet, in explaining the beliefs, thoughts and views of Ibn Taymiyah due to the daily attacks we witness throughout the world against the people of Dīn and Imaan, especially against the Mashāikh and 'Ulamā' of Deoband. Also, because we saw how the Salafī sect was declaring Allaah's friends and the pious slaves to be Kāfir and outside the pale of Imaan and Dīn. We saw them excess against the Ṣaḥābah ψ and the Aimmah of Dīn. I therefore saw it as my Dīnī duty to prevent them

from what can only be loss for them in this world and the next. I had no better way than this booklet to guide them to the Straight Path.

Praise be to Allaah in the beginning and end. Salutations and peace be upon the Nabī of guidance, the Chosen One, eternal guidance whenever the remembering ones remember him and whenever the forgetful ones forget him.

I am Muḥammad Abū Bakr Ghāzīpūrī bin Mawlā Bakhsh al-Anṣārī.

This book was completed in great haste with other engagements, through the grace of Allaah, during Shawwāl 1427 Hijrī.

Appendix: Ibn Taymiyah was not a true ‘Ālim

Despite Ibn Taymiyah being a scholar of many diverse subjects, he was not a true ‘Ālim. He was not a religious and just ‘Ālim. As for his lack of religiosity, it is because of his apathy in speaking against seniors, even against the Ṣaḥābah ψ and Ambiyaa *‘alayhimus salām*. There have been many examples in this booklet concerning his irreligiousness.

As for him not being a true ‘Ālim, he was not versed in quoting from the early generations. He used to attribute statements to them without any proof. This is clear to anyone who reads his writings.

His “knowledge” of the Quraan is made apparent by his commentary on the āyah, “And what is wrong with you that you do not believe in Allaah, whereas the Rasūl calls you…” This has been commented on.

As for his knowledge of Ḥadīth, he was also not a research scholar, nothing with deep-understanding, nor justice.

As for his lack of justice, he made weak Aḥādīth to be strong on the basis of prattle, when that Ḥadīth was in concord with his desires. He would make a strong Ḥadīth to be weak if it was contrary to his desires.

As for his lack of deep-insight, he would not distinguish between weak and strong Ḥadīth and would mix them.

As for his lack of research, he would often fall into confusion and mix the words of Rasulullaah ρ with the Ṣaḥābah ψ and vice-versa. He would make *Mursal* Ḥadīth Marfū‘ and vice-versa. He would join authentic to weak and weak to authentic.

We now present unto some examples of what we have said, from a small booklet of his, whose pages do not exceed 66. It is called *al-Waṣīyah al-Kubrā*. In it he mentioned the basic beliefs of Dīn and principles of Islaam.

We mention these examples here, so that his affair may be clear, and the readers not be deceived by those who are extremists in their love and veneration for him. In fact, they raise him above being a human. They don him in the highest of titles and count him from amongst the most august ‘Ulamā’ of Islaam. They believe that Allaah has not created the like of him in knowledge, virtue, memory and piety.

Here are some examples from the booklet:

“He who reads the Quraan and ponders over it, will receive ten rewards for every letter.” [p38]

He mentioned this Ḥadīth and did not mention that it is extremely weak.

He also wrote, “Abū Bakr and ‘Umar *raḍiyAllaahu ‘anhumā* said, ‘Memorising the diacritics of the Quraan is more beloved to us than memorising some of its letters.” [p38]
This supposed narration is not to be found in any book.

He mentioned a famous Ḥadīth is these words, “*Khayrul Qurūn qarnī,*” despite there being no source for the word “*Qarnī*”

He mentioned the Ḥadīth of al-‘Abbās τ complaining about the harshness of a certain people. The Nabī ρ then said, “By He who holds my life in His Hand, they will not enter Jannah until they love you for my sake.” [p43]
Such a Ḥadīth is not recorded in the books in these words. There are however other words, but in any case, it is a weak Ḥadīth according to the Salafīs, because amongst the narrators is Yazīd bin Abī Ziyād al-Qurashī who is a weak narrator according to the majority of the Muḥaddithūn.

Ibn Taymiyah also narrated this Ḥadīth from Ibn ‘Umar τ, “The first army to attack Constantinople will be forgiven.” [p46]
This is indeed nothing but a fantasy on his part. He narrated it from al-Bukhārī, whereas the narrator there is in fact ‘Umayr bin al-Aswad, not Ibn ‘Umar τ. In addition, Ibn Taymiyah did not quote the correct words of the Ḥadīth. The correct words are, “…the first of my Ummah to attack Caesar’s city will be forgiven.”
Such was Ibn Taymiyah, randomly snatching words of Ḥadīth.

He narrated the Ḥadīth, “The Nabī ρ passed by Abū Mūsā, who was reciting the Quraan, and intently started to listen to his recitation…”
The Ḥadīth with those words and narrators is weak. There is however a Ḥadīth in Muslim with the same meaning. Ibn Taymiyah never researched it. He narrated a weak Ḥadīth and abandoned the authentic Ḥadīth.

He also narrated, “Verily Allaah more intently listens to a man reciting the Quraan, than a master listening to his slave-girl.” This Ḥadīth is weak and he did not mention its weakness. Perhaps he did not even know.

He mentioned that Rasulullaah ρ taught his Ṣaḥābah ψ to recite the following when they visit the graveyard, “*As-salāmu ‘alykum dāra qaymim mu’minīn. Wa innā inshāAllaahu bikum lāḥiqūn. Yarḥamullāhul mustaqdimīna minnā wa min kum wal musta’khirīn. Nas’alullāha lanā wa lakumul ‘āfiyah. Lā tuḥarrimnā ajrahum wa lā taftinnā ba‘dahum. Waghfir lanā wa lahum.”*

This du‘ā is not narrated in these words from Rasulullaah ρ in any book of Ḥadīth. He concocted the du‘ā himself by joining one Ḥadīth to another; joining an authentic Ḥadīth to a weak Ḥadīth; and further adding his own words. He then had the audacity to attribute this du‘ā to Rasulullaah ρ who did not say it.

This is Ibn Taymiyah, the Imām of the present Saalfīs and their leader in Dīn. The “Hero” of Islaam about whom they say that Allaah never created the like of him amongst the ‘Ulamā’.

Ibn Taymiyah would at times follow nothing but his desires in accepting or rejecting a Ḥadīth. What his desires liked he accepted, and what it disliked he rejected. You have seen for example, how he accepted weak Ḥadīth and used them as evidence, and some of them were in fact extremely weak. On the other hand he rejects and belies the following Ḥadīth, “My Rabb Most Honourable and Majestic came to me in the best of forms…” al-Imām Aḥmad narrated it in his Musnad from ‘Abdur Razzāq from Ma‘mar from Ayyūb from Abū Qilābah from Ibn ‘Abbās τ. At-Tirmiẓī narrated it with a different chain. This is an impeccable chain without a dust particle on it. In addition, as stated in at-Tirmiẓī, al-Bukhārī also authenticated it. At-Tirmiẓī said, “I asked Muḥammad bin Ismā‘īl about this Ḥadīth, and he replied, ‘This is an authentic Ḥadīth.’”

Ibn Taymiyah rejected this authentic Ḥadīth and said, “Every Ḥadīth that states that Muḥammad ρ saw his Rabb with his eyes on earth is a lie….similarly the Ḥadīth which people of knowledge narrate, ‘I saw my Rabb in such-and-such a state…’” [p24]

Look at the audacity of this man who declared an authentic Ḥadīth to be a lie, solely on the basis of his desires. He took the measure of acceptance and rejection to be in his hand. *Innā illāhi wa innā ilayhi rāji‘ūn*.

Ibn Taymiyah practised his fancies in many Ḥadīth and other important matters. This is not hidden from the ‘Ulamā’ of Ḥadīth. For example, he wrote in his booklet that Rasulullaah ρ was given Sūratul Fātiḥah from a treasure beneath the *‘Arsh*? This is a grave mistake and clear fancy. Rasulullaah ρ was not given Sūratul Fātiḥah from the treasures beneath the *‘Arsh*. What he was given from the treasure beneath the *‘Arsh* is was the last two verses of Sūratul Baqarah. This al-Imām Aḥmad narrated from Ḥuẓayfah τ in his *Musnad*.

His booklet does not exceed 66 pages, yet look at these few examples which shows his low knowledge and understanding of Ḥadīth. What then would you think of those writings of his which run into many volumes and so many pages?

It should now be clear that Ibn Taymiyah was not an ‘Ālim versed in the sciences of Sharī‘ah. He was not a resort to be relied upon in taking and rejecting. He is not reliable enough to be a leader in Dīn, due to his many diversion from the beliefs of the Ahlus Sunnah wal Jamā‘ah, and his many personal contrary views. That is why the researcher-‘Ulamā’ do not accept his statements.

As for the extremism displayed by his party in exalting him, that is an excess which Allaah and His Rasūl ρ do not love.

Yes, he – may Allaah's mercy be upon him – had a strong memory and memorised many Ḥadīth and statements of the 'Ulamā' in various fields. He could produce and spread what he wished. He was a prolific writer and a spontaneous debater. However, these qualities and firmness in knowledge and understanding of Dīn are not the same. It is not given except to those whom Allaah wishes good.

Finally, we ask Allaah, Most Noble and Merciful, to guide us to uprights deeds and words. May He avert evil from us through His grace. May He grant us goodness in this world and the next. He is the All-Hearing, Answerer of Du'ā. Allaah's salutations and peace be upon His 'Arab Nabī Muḥammad, and all his Companions, pure Family and pure Wives.

Muḥammad Abū Bakr Ghāzīpūrī

[Note: all the quotations were taken from the footnotes to the booklet]

About the Book:

This work can be divided into three parts – the first linking the statements of Ibn Taymiyah to the authentic Sufis, the second quoting some of the ludicrous beliefs of the great icon of the Salafis and the third, as the appendix explains, that Ibn Taymiyah was not a true Alim by academic standards.

Few years ago even reliable scholars thought that no-one was better than Al-Bani but when his knowledge was un-velied he became history. Ibn Tayimah's path to oblivion is following close by.

Translation edited by:
Mufti A H Elias (May Allaah protect him)

1430/2009
Shabaan/August